UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

THE PRISON UNIVERSITY: AN INVESTIGATION OF POST-SECONDARY EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS IN CANADIAN FEDERAL PENITENTIARIES.

BY

DENNIS LYNES

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfilment of the degree of Master of Arts.

DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY

Edmonton, Alberta

Fall, 1994

National Library of Canada
Acquisitions and Bibliographic Services Branch
395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Direction des acquisitions et des services bibliographiques
395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-94877-9

Canada

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR: DENNIS NEIL LYNES

TITLE OF THESIS: THE PRISON UNIVERSITY: AN INVESTIGATION OF POST-SECONDARY EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS IN CANADIAN FEDERAL PENITENTIARIES

DEGREE: MASTER OF ARTS

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED: FALL 1994

Permission is hereby granted to the University of Alberta Library to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves all other publication and other rights in association with the copyright in the thesis, and except as hereinbefore provided neither the thesis nor any substantial portion thereof may be printed or otherwise reproduced in any material form whatever without the author's prior written permission

(signed) D. Lynes

PERMANENT ADDRESS: 9660 - 79 AVENUE

Edmonton, Alberta

T2C 0S4

Date: July 11, 1994

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled "The Prison University: An Investigation of Post-Secondary Educational Programs in Canadian Federal Prisons", submitted by Dennis Lynes in partial fulfilment of the degree of Master of Arts.

Dr. A.D. Fisher, Supervisor

Dr. J. DeBernardi

Dr. J. Creechan

May 19, 1994

ABSTRACT

This thesis examines post-secondary education in Canadian federal prisons. The prison university program is investigated from the perspective of prison educators, prisoner-students, and researchers concerned with various correctional phenomena. Similarly, the value of the prison university is discussed using a number of approaches including correctional, educational, and social. The discipline of anthropology is used to provide an interesting and fruitful approach with which to examine education as a specific method of correctional treatment.

Chapter one is primarily concerned with explaining correctional treatment, defining the nature of the prison environment, and discussing the merits of anthropology as a specific approach to the value of post-secondary education in federal prisons. The middle chapter describes existing prison university programs and the differences between programs oriented to the two principle modes of delivery: lecture and correspondence. The final chapter makes some observations concerning the potential of the prison university as both an effective method of correctional treatment and an exemplary social institution.

The prison university is presented as a possible model illustrating the benefits which might develop from an expanded educational program throughout the penal system. Consequently, educational policies relating to the effectiveness of post-secondary education as a correctional treatment program are emphasized. The effectiveness of the prison university is discussed not only in reference to correctional treatment programs but in light of personal, social, and environmental influences.

Since education and corrections are two of society's largest and most complicated institutions, particular attention is payed to the complexity of the relationship between them throughout the thesis.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to both the academic and support staff, Department of Anthropology, for the considerable assistance granted to me during the course of my graduate studies, 1991-1994. In particular I must acknowledge my supervisor, Dr. A. Fisher, and the Secretary to the Chair, Darlene. Without their help, I would never have been given the opportunity to study at the graduate level.

Finally, I would like to especially thank my wife, Lori, without whose unfailing support, this thesis would be incomplete.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
The Two Principle Approaches	4
Theoretical Framework	7
CHAPTER ONE	11
Does Correctional Treatment Work?	11
Why Correctional Treatment Programs Work	15
An Anthropological Approach to Correctional Treatment	18
Education and Power	22
CHAPTER TWO	29
The British Columbia Prison University Program	29
CSC and the Prison University Program	37
Correspondence Studies Compared to the Classroom	43
The Purpose of Prison Education	46
The Student Body	51
The Effects of Post-Secondary Education in Prison	55
CHAPTER THREE	58
Education and Training	58
The Prison University as Effective Correctional Treatment	60

Education as a Right 63

Social Justice or Social Control 65

Environmental, Social and Personal Influences 67

Anthropology and the Prison University 70

Correctional Program or Social Program? 73

CONCLUSION 76

REFERENCES 78

INTRODUCTION

The prison that darkest region in the apparatus of justice, is the place where the power to punish, which no longer dares to manifest itself openly, silently organizes a field of objectivity in which punishment will be able to function openly as treatment and the sentence be inscribed among the discourses of knowledge. -Foucault-

Almost from the beginning a single problem has confounded correctional philosophy: the opposition between rehabilitation and security. Today the emphasis is on security, and considerable pressure exists to abandon altogether correctional treatment programs oriented towards rehabilitation (see Travis et al 1992:248). Consequently, I approached my thesis topic, whether or not advanced education in prison is an effective method of correctional treatment, with some trepidation. I was also concerned that my subject might be, at best, only peripherally related to the discipline of anthropology. Somewhat paradoxically, it was this concern that, in the end, convinced me to retain both my thesis topic and an anthropological approach.

After all, I am not studying sociology, or political science, or economics, or even criminology or education, for a number of, I believe, quite valid reasons. Foremost among them is the distinctly humane perspective in which anthropology views the

world and its problems. Coincidentally, in his Distinguished Lecture before the American Anthropological Association in December, 1992, Roy Rappaport advises: "First", prior to any anthropological approach to domestic research, "we must examine our own values and make them, so far as they are relevant, explicit" (Rappaport 1993:297). And an humane perspective is tremendously relevant to the whole field of corrections.

So are a number of other core values pertinent to the discipline. Rappaport specifically comments on the advantages of anthropology's holistic nature (1993:297), but in the sense that the discipline is guided by certain values and especially as they apply to my topic, 'cultural relativism' becomes of paramount concern. In their most recent edition of Cultural Anthropology, Bates and Plog describe the concept as an "ability to see things , to some degree, as others see them", and caution that although this ability is learned only with difficulty, the "products of cultural relativism - objectivity, empathy, and informed judgment - are indispensible to the anthropologist" (1991:6). Furthermore, examining the prison university from an anthropological perspective, in the light of the relationship between cultural relativism and the humane nature of cultural anthropology in general, seems to provide a novel and fruitful argument supporting its effectiveness.

Over fifty years ago, in her influencial and aptly entitled essay, "An Anthropologist's View of Values and Morality", Ruth Benedict explained the anthropological conception of cultural relativism (see: Alston and Brandt 1978:143-

49). She pointed out that since "the vast majority of the individuals in any group are shaped to the fashion of that culture", normal behaviour, including conduct peceived as 'right' and 'wrong', or 'lawful' and 'unlawful', is simply defined according to the values of the cultural majority, or the mainstream of society (cited in Grassian 1981:41). Most prisoners are members of groups, or subcultures, with values different from those of the mainstream. Consequently, it might be argued that the concept of cultural relativism almost compels the anthropologist to view prisoners in non-judgmental terms. In any case, it certainly behooves her/him to view the argument concerning the effectiveness of post-secondary education in prison with 'objectivity, empathy, and informed judgment'. As Harris puts it: "Scientific objectivity does not arise from having no biases - everyone is biased - but from taking care not to let one's biases influence the result of research" (1992:125).

THE TWO PRINCIPLE APPROACHES

Education alone may serve as a penitentiary instrument. The question of penitentiary imprisonment is a question of education. -Lucas-

Although numerous opinions exist concerning the best ways to educate prisoners, upon anything more than a cursory examination it soon becomes evident that these ideas can be placed in two main categories: 'developmentalist' and 'environmentalist'. I discuss these terms in some detail later (see: particularly 30-35). In summary, the former argument is based chiefly on Piaget's cognitive development studies and Kohlberg's work on moral development(see, Duguid, for example, especially 1981:149). At the worst, it can be dismissed as 'Lombrosian wine in a new bottle'; but at its best, it is well-argued, surprisingly valid empirically, and only faintly reductionist. The latter argument is from a position well within the mainstream of cultural anthropology, emphasizing the role of the environment in accounting for human differences (see: Bates and Plog 1991:3; and Freire 1970:27-57).

From this, it might appear that the developmentalists are going to be bashed about with a 'straw man'; admittedly, most North American educators, accomplishing the bulk of positive work in the field of advanced education, seem to have bought into the theory (see, for a small example, Duguid 1981, 1983, 1988; Barker and Germanotta, cited in Jones 1992:12-13; Morin 1981). For this reason, however, and

because the argument can be further reduced to the age-old controversy between free-will and determinism, I conclude that little can be achieved by attacking the developmentalists. Indeed, since they are doing most of the practical work in prison education and because I am interested in attaining the same results, i.e. the expansion of the prison university based upon a liberal arts/humanities approach, further criticism might serve to expand an already significant schism between the two theories when my intention is to present a thesis that can unify them.

While this might appear unrealistically ambitious, the fact that anthropology is a somewhat novel perspective in which to be examining the prison university as a correctional treatment program surely advances the possibility of arriving at a synthesis, especially between competing theories that have been developed outside of the discipline. Anthropology's holistic nature helps here, and again I follow Rappaport's lead. He says "that any adequate understanding of the contemporary situation and any adequate theory for correcting its ills must be holistic...[because the number of domestic social problems is so extensive] that they cannot all be named, much less studied" (1993: 297). Accordingly, I have drawn upon numerous disciplines outside the field of anthropology; relied upon interviews, books, journals, newspapers, television, and personal experience of a kind 'related' to participant observation; and used informants ranging from Alston to Zimbardo, from prisoners to prison educators, and from prisoner-students to students of the prison.

I emphasize 'related' since my experience as a prisoner-student was not a part of

an organized study or a research design. However, I was directly involved with prison university programs in several penitentiaries for nearly ten years. I began studying by correspondence through Athabasca University (AU) in 1983 and completed my Bachelor of Arts in history from that institution in 1988. Since graduate courses were unavailable, I continued studying at the undergraduate level until my release in 1990. Overall, the prison experience leads me to conclude that my academic progress was realized in spite of, rather than because of, the quality of post-secondary educational programs and the various curricula to which I was exposed.

For example, initially I was refused admission to the university program in Edmonton Institution because, as a 'n-time' loser, I could not demonstrate an adequate academic background. Consequently, I was forced to create one by borrowing the money to purchase a course from AU which I completed on my own time during the evenings and on weekends. When finally allowed to enroll in the program officially, my cell became my designated work area and my grade of employment remained at the lowest possible level for a number of years. My experience with the university programs in Drumheller and Stony Mountain was similarly frustrating.

On the positive side, the prison university did afford me an opportunity - albeit stifled by organizational problems, institutional red-tape, and other administrational shortcomings - to expose myself to an academic environment of which I previously

knew very little. I became genuinely interested and I still am. Moreover, my experience is not unique. In prison, I met many prisoner-students similar to myself; that is, of roughly the same age, background, and apparent enthusiasm. Further, while researching this thesis, I encountered a number of articles written by prisoner-students and ex-prisoner-students which described experiences with the prison university much like my own.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

A new service can no more invade old territory unchallenged than can a new hummingbird, though there be ample nectar. -Anonymous-

Although my thesis topic must be examined from the perspective of the larger issue concerning rehabilitation and control, the anthropological approach to the prison university is not, in itself, any part of the debate over treatment versus security. Hence, there is little discussion of recidivism and less of control/confinement theories. My thesis is intended to establish that post-secondary educational programs do not have to be considered within the limits of an 'either/or' perspective. Nevertheless, since existing practices and programs are in fact very limited by the realities of the prison environment, these must be described. Therefore, the initial chapter is concerned chiefly with defining the argument,

establishing its parameters, and discussing the particulars of my approach to it.

In the middle chapter, I describe the importance of advanced education for prisoners and discuss post-secondary education in Canadian federal prisons. The evidence indicates that, although particular modes of delivery are important, prisoners can complete post-secondary educational programs successfully in programs oriented to both a lecture and a correspondence format. Some controversy exists regarding the composition of the prison student body, and it is not limited to the debate concerning whether or not prisoner-students can be described correctly as being cognitively and/or morally retarded. In order to present a meaningful course curriculum, especially with the limited funds available for prison programs, educators must be able to relate to their students. Thus, some knowledge concerning the ethnic and socio-economic background of prisoner-students, and perhaps a realistic impression of their collective world view, might contribute to a course curriculum that is both more attractive to prisoners and more pertinent to their situation.

My conclusion is concerned with discussing 'what must be done' to improve that situation. Research suggests that the prison university can be seen as an effective correctional treatment program, yet potentially it is much more. By contributing to the improvement of both the prison and the larger social environment, post-secondary education in the prison provides a service more social than correctional (a perhaps somewhat fortunate result since an anthropological approach seems to lend itself to both social and environmental matters). In any case, education is a

process that transcends the prison and must be discussed in human and, hence, social terms. Accordingly, I conclude my thesis with some observations concerning education and society, education and the prison, education and human nature, and education and 'humanization'.

Recently, anthropologists have concerned themselves with a multiplicity of domestic issues, an unconventional if not new approach which Rappaport calls 'engaged anthropology'. He says that the engaged approach provides a ground, or a rationale, for corrective strategies, or adaptive responses, intended to rehabilitate social systems deformed by maladaptations (1993:301). Although Rappaport's account is by his own admission only "tentative", I have followed his lead throughout the organization of my thesis. Accordingly, and in a very general sense, the prison and entire field of corrections is seen as maladaptive due to the 'subordination of the fundamental to the instrumental', a process which especially "as a concomitant of technical and sociocultural evolution" allows increasingly narrow interest groups to become increasingly more powerful -or for the instrumental to usurp the status of the fundamental (Rappaport 1993:300). Rappaport observes that this process is particularly responsible for generating social injustices in a capitalistic regime.

Adaptive responses in the case of the prison are correctional strategies intended to restore adaptiveness to a system deformed by the prison, or in the broadest sense, to make corrections work. The prison university is an adaptive strategy which I conclude is working, although the evidence of particularly Foucault (1979) indicates

that powerful social forces exist which impede any revolutionary change in the traditional organization or structure of the penal system. Certainly, the prison university is not a big enough or strong enough program to effect the changes necessary to make the prison function as a mechanism to reduce crime, nor could it function in that capacity even if it were expanded significantly. Howevever, prison post-secondary educational programs might be used as an example illustrating the possible benefits of expanding educational programming throughout the penal system, which is a process that could make the prison function as a crime reducing social institution. Accordingly, throughout the thesis, I am particularly attentive to educational policies that relate to the success of the prison university as a correctional treatment program.

CHAPTER ONE

DOES CORRECTIONAL TREATMENT WORK?

He who opens a school door, closes a prison. -Victor Hugo-

Before determining if the prison university might be an effective method of correctional treatment, it must first be established if any treatment can be effective within a correctional environment. Until the mid-nineteen sixties, correctional policies centered around the concept of rehabilitation. In most instances this approach required professional intervention, usually involving some form of psychological therapy. Since offenders were seen as 'sick', treatment programs were designed to discover the psychological problems that motivated criminal behaviour. This approach became known as 'The Medical Model'. However, the notion that correctional treatment could ultimately effect a 'cure' led to the evaluation of nearly all treatment programs according to a single criterion: recidivism. Successes simply never reoffended; failures always did.

In Corrections (1992) Travis, Schwartz, and Clear discuss shortcomings of the rehabilitative approach to correctional treatment (235-48). They point out that 'conceptualization' of offenders results in an often disabling "confusion of correctional purposes...between the treatment of sick persons and the punishment of bad persons"

(1992:237). Moreover, they find it even more disturbing that the emphasis on rehabilitation prompts many prisoners to feign reform in order to convince a parole agency that they are 'cured', and hence ready for release. This largely contributes to the problems that parole authorities encounter when attempting to predict prisoners who are likely to reoffend. Consequently, as Braithwaite and Pettit observe, "most evidence suggests that with the best techniques available we are wrong about twice as often as we are right in predicting serious reoffending" (1990:3).

Although the rehabilitative ideal came under attack during the mid-nineteen sixties, most researchers (Travis et al 1992; John DiIulio 1991:105-07; Cullen and Gendreau 1989:23-30) relate its demise to the publication of Robert Martinson's "What Works - Questions and Answers about Prison Reform" in 1974. After presenting his evaluation of over two hundred treatment programs Martinson concluded that:"With few and isolated exceptions, the rehabilitative efforts that have been reported so far have had no appreciable effect on recidivism" (1974:25). In any case, by the late nineteen seventies public and political opinion alike held that 'nothing works' and rehabilitation was no longer the dominant correctional ideology. Nevertheless, the value of correctional treatment, including psychological, vocational, and educational programming, remained the subject of much lively debate.

Treatment was criticized, moreover, not only because it seemed ineffective, but because it represented a concept antithetical to the prevailing ideology of retribution. Indeed, Cullen and Gendreau argue pursuasively that the popularity of the 'nothing

works' idea was as much the product of a particular social climate as it was an intellectual conclusion(1992-24-30). Regardless, the debate has continued now for some twenty years with no resolution in evidence. Although a retributivist ideology remains prevalent, it seems more than notable that "we continue to develop and support treatment programs for offenders under criminal supervision" (Travis et al 1992:235).

In fact, a number of researchers suggest that the continued presence of treatment programs can be explained by their capacity to achieve useful objectives other than reduced rates of recidivism (see: Cullen and Gendreau 1989:31-39; Lipton, Martinson, and Wilks 1975:532-58). For example, treatment programs have been linked in a variety of ways to better methods of institutional management (DiIulio 1991:114; MacLean 1992:21-28). Moreover, the presence of correctional treatment programs is also explained on purely philosophical grounds. The determinist believes that the only ethical justification for the existence of prisons is their ability to provide the causal mechanisms necessary to promote behavioural change in prisoners (see: Alston and Brandt 1978:393-402). Conversely, the central idea of the various retributivist theories is the notion that punishment is simply something an offender deserves. Hence, the retributivist believes that treatment "ought not to be provided even if [it] can be shown to improve management, to enhance conditions, to lower costs, and/or to reduce recidivism" (DiIulio 1991:124).

However, notwithstanding the retributivist argument, and the fact that programs

might contribute to more orderly prisons, most studies criticizing correctional treatment emphasize only its inability to curtail recidivism. Yet Michael Maltz contends that recidivism rates are an inappropriate measure of a program's effectiveness, "since...we truly do not know enough about recidivism to make either absolute or comparative statements about its extent" (1984:1). Maltz points out that recidivism measures failure, whereas evaluative measurements of success are often more accurate indications of a treatment program's effectiveness (see: 1984:10-11). However, studies attempting to evaluate success are more difficult to construct. They often require investigation into aspects of an offender's life that he or she might consider private and confidential. Further, while recidivism can be measured and evaluated mechanistically, concepts such as self-esteem, personal growth, and happiness are value laden terms which are difficult to evaluate in even the best of circumstances (see: Maltz 1984:18-26)

In summary, then, it seems evident that although Martinson's study clearly represents an ideological turning point in the field of corrections, it just as clearly does not represent the demise of the rehabilitative ideal. In fact, Cullen and Gendreau observe that Martinson's review seems to have stimulated "an extensive literature attesting to the fact that rehabilitative programs can 'work' and work in several areas for a variety of offenders" (1989:32). Consequently, they suggest that the truly significant question is no longer simply 'whether treatment is effective', but 'why treatment is effective'.

WHY CORRECTIONAL TREATMENT PROGRAMS WORK

A number of studies indicate that certain underlying principles, such as staff/offender matching, program/offender matching, and multiple modality approaches, account for the success or failure of particular treatment programs (see: for example, Palmer 1992:263-65; Cullen and Gendreau 1989:32-34; Ross and Fabiano 1981:73-75). The overall effectiveness of a specific form of treatment may be contingent upon the proper application of these principles. Even Martinson appears to realize that treatment can be effective for certain groups of offenders in certain situations. "The critical fact seems to be the conditions under which the program is delivered" (Martinson quoted in Palmer 1992:261). An essential condition of effective treatment is that it incorporate a variety of strategies; for example, vocational training and counselling and assertiveness training. In fact, after a thorough review of the correctional literature published between 1973 and 1981, Ross and Fabiano declare that "no effective programs were found which did not employ a multi-facetted approach" (1981:73).

It is difficult to say more about the reasons why some correctional treatment 'works' because of the conflicting opinions expressed by researchers and scholars regarding the definition of an effective program. Ross and Fabiano list nine components which they contend have been identified by researchers as necessary elements of effective correctional programming (see: 1981:74-75), but like most

researchers they emphasize and, hence, discuss only one or two. Most authorities would agree that the ultimate aim of treatment is the increased protection of society, the conflict of opinion arises from the various means to achieve this aim. Palmer thinks that the issue might be clarified by examining aims, or objectives, from the perspective of both society and the offender (1992:257-58).

He explains that the 'social' objective of treatment is achieved through the reduction of illegal behaviour and, hence, usually expressed through statistics reflecting recidivism. Conversely, the 'offender' objective is achieved through the changed behaviour of the offender and is expressed through increased self-esteem, better coping ability, reduced aggression, etc. Further, Palmer sees the offender objective as primarily a 'means' to the social objective - or the 'end'. However, while Palmer's explanation might adequately reflect the source of controversy concerning the definition of effective treatment, it also reflects, at least from an anthropological perspective, what appears to be a generally overlooked approach to research concerning the entire subject of correctional treatment programs.

The emphasis on protecting society through correcting only the behaviour of the individual offender implies erroneously that society does not need correcting, that society is always a victim , never a perpetrator (for a related discussion, Maltz 1984:4). However, many social observers contend that society must be considered at least co-responsible for some criminal activity. They argue that government policies, by excluding segments of the population from an equal access to

opportunity, create subcultures in which participation in illegal activities is the norm (see: Henry 1991:253-57). The cultural anthropologist is likely more sensitive to such issues than other social scientists because one of the discipline's core concepts, cultural relativism, teaches that the actions of other groups should be viewed "from within the context of their culture matrix rather than one's own"(Bates and Plog 1991:6).

In any case, an anthropological approach to the definition of an effective correctional treatment program would require that consideration be given to protecting society by correcting it. Such an approach does not imply that the prevailing ethical, moral, and especially legal standards are wrong, only that they are relative to particular sociocultural situations rather than absolute. In light of the fact that anthropologists often have traditionally identified with the poor, the powerless, and the oppressed, it is somewhat surprising that they "have been so invisible in criminal justice research, policy, and practice" (Glasser and Sutro 1992:3). Nevertheless, an increasing body of evidence suggests that cultural anthropology, more than because of its emphasis on relativism, is the discipline best equipped to investigate some aspects of the criminal justice system, including correctional issues such as the viability of treatment.

AN ANTHROPOLOGICAL APPROACH TO CORRECTIONAL TREATMENT

The issue for [anthropologists] is how to translate concern into action; and an anthropologist without concern is no anthropologist at all. -A.P.Cohen-

Anthropology is 'coming home', so to speak, and finding itself well equipped to investigate domestic issues (see: Jackson 1987:1-15; Messerschmidt 1981:1-14). American anthropologists have concerned themselves recently with class, gender oppression, ethnic identity, cultural pluralism, inequality, and many related issues (see: Rappaport 1993:296). Moreover, in an edition of Practicing Anthropology devoted entirely to addressing issues in criminal justice, Mark Fleisher reports that contemporary anthropologists are with increasing frequency "using their unique perspectives to cast light on tough social issues in American society, including its criminal justice system" (vol.14, No.3, 1992:231). And the Anthropological Code of Ethics, which guarantees that informants are treated with consideration, conscientiousness, and an overall regard for the preeminence of their individuality and dignity, certainly prepares cultural anthropologists, in particular, for research into the sensitive issues they are sure to encounter in the arena of criminal justice. Despite its domestic orientation, Rappaport observes that the 'new' anthropology - he calls it an 'engaged' approach - remains guided by core concepts of the discipline such as holism, cultural relativity, and participant observation (1993:297 and 301).

He points out that an important feature of the engaged approach is the capacity "to grasp people's understandings of the difficulties they are facing and to help those people make those understandings explicit to themselves and intelligible and audible to others" (1993:302). Thus an engaged approach towards comprehending the effectiveness of correctional treatment seems especially promising, not only because of its capacity to interpret the prisoner's appreciation of the treatment program's impact, but because of its concern with making audible the difficulties facing prisoners involved in treatment programs. And these difficulties are far from obvious. Foucault makes it clear that rehabilitative treatment programs must struggle with cultural and social factors distinct from those overtly affecting corrections (for example, 1979:231-308). In addition, such programs must have the power to have an impact upon human development with strength sufficient to cause behavioural change despite opposition from social forces that have been developing for centuries. For example, Foucault observes that the prison not only contributes "almost inevitably" to recidivism, it contributes to the overall criminality that links everyone involved in the justice system together and that "for a century and a half has caught them in the same trap" (1979:255).

According to Foucault's analysis, the prison might be seen as a 'maladaption', or one of "those disorderings of structure that in their nature both generate troubles and impede the capacities of social systems to respond to them" (Rappaport:1993:300). In this 'engaged' anthropological sense, treatment can be seen as an adaptive

response intended to repair the social system (Rappaport 1993:300). Rappaport advises that such repairs may be more effective if conducted at the local, or community, level (1993:300) - advice that corresponds accurately with Smith and Berlin's comments concerning the future of correctional treatment. They point out that "it is in the community that the individual becomes a criminal, and it is in the community that we need to give him support and counseling to effect a prosocial adaptation to living" (1988:vii). Maeve McMahon, in The Persistent Prison?, concludes also that the future of corrections lies in the community (see: 1992:23-24). Consequently, perhaps it is fortunate that anthropologists are finally turning themselves toward domestic research, for no social science is better equipped to at once investigate correctional treatment, the community, the larger social system, and the complex relationships involved between them.

Foucault describes the sometimes perplexingly complicated nature of some of these relationships in The Birth of the Prison (1979). He insists, for example, that the prison is a success rather than a failure. "For the observation that the prison fails to eliminate crime", he says, "one should [observe] that prison has succeeded extremely well in producing delinquency" (1979:277). Foucault imagines that prisons can be seen as the factories "whose convict-workers are both the cogs and the products" responsible for keeping an immense criminal justice bureaucracy employed (1979:242, and 242-92). Thus, the prison is able to withstand the most energetic attempts to reform it (1979:298-308). More importantly, any treatment intended to

curtail reoffending must overcome not only the established behaviour of the offender, but the established social order. For example, perhaps some treatment programs are ineffective because the established order - which includes numerous individuals living off of the functional but legal benefits of crime, such as police officers, lawyers, prison guards, etc. - finds them maladaptive. Therefore, effective correctional treatment can be seen as an adaptive response intended to change, or repair, the social order. However, in this case the response must be of sufficient force to overcome the somewhat covert benefits, and hence social strength, associated with the continued presence of crime and prisons.

An 'engaged' anthropological approach might contribute towards generating the power. That is, in the sense that knowledge equals power (Giroux 1988:203-215), an engaged approach towards understanding correctional treatment might be expected to provide novel data of a type resulting in both better methods of evaluating existing programs and of constructing new ones. Accordingly, an investigation of the prison university can be seen as " 'microanthropological' research which is as much interpretive as it is material in orientation" (Rappaport 1993:302). And, as Rappaport explains, the 'macroanthropological' conception relies upon research of this nature (1993:301-02). In any case, the relationship between knowledge and power provides an interesting and perhaps fruitful perspective in which to examine education as a specific method of correctional treatment.

EDUCATION AND POWER

The power of [human] nature must be measured not by the power of the separate individual but by the power of society. -Marx and Engels-

Henry Giroux writes extensively concerning the 'power' of education (especially 1987;1988). He points out that in the West education traditionally has been used to replicate the existing social structure, or the values of the dominant class (1988:3-8). Consequently, he calls for a new, radical form of education that can rescue social justice "from the ravages and power of the dominant ideology" (Giroux 1988:215). He maintains that "[e]ducators need to take as their first concern the issue of empowerment" (1988:214), and he suggests that Paulo Freire has developed one of the very few 'practical models' upon which such a philosophy of education might be developed. While Freire can be examined for theoretical insights concerning the relationship betweeen education and empowerment, then, Stephen Duguid can be investigated for information concerning the specifics of the relationship in a prison setting (see: Duguid 1981; 1983; 1986; 1988). Although Duguid and Freire are ideological foes, so to speak, their ultimate objectives are alike. Both wish to emancipate the oppressed.

Duguid contends that a necessary theoretical and structural aspect of a successful prison university program is the creation and maintenance of an 'alternate

community'. He describes it as an area apart from the prison proper, where the environment is patterned after that of the campus and where "behaviour commensurate with more advanced and sophisticated levels of thinking and acting can take place, thus reinforcing the effects of the educational experience" (1983:303). However, as Duguid recognizes, a prison education can serve to liberate prisoner-students from far more than the intellectually stifling existence of the day-to-day prison routine. He leaves no doubt of his strong belief that education can empower individuals to change both themselves and their worlds for the better (see: Duguid 1988:174). But Duguid is no Paulo Freire. He would use education, not as a process of achieving true self-discovery and a consequent freedom from ideological control (as would Freire, 1970), but as a process of directing the development of prisoners in manners acceptable to the government - or the dominant class. For example, he says "that in the case of prison education behavioural outcomes are probably as important as educational outcomes" (Duguid 1988:174, emphasis in original).

Of course, Duguid is concerned with behavioural outcomes because he measures educational success in terms of recidivism (see: Ayers and Duguid 1980). In fact, nearly every study concerned with measuring the effectiveness of correctional treatment programs relies on recidivism as the primary means of determining the success or failure of a particular program. Yet this emphasis on recidivism as the proper measure of correctional effectiveness has serious disadvantages (Maltz 1984). MacLean points out that it reduces prison education to simply an attempt to change

an individual's predisposition towards criminal behaviour. A prison university program becomes just another method of social control (MacLean 1992:26-27). Furthermore, and perhaps even more telling, Maltz observes that "using recidivism as a measure of correctional effectiveness implies that offenders - not society - need correcting" (1984:4). However, post-secondary education in prison does not have to be evaluated primarily in terms of recidivism and it does not have to be directed in manners acceptable to any agency or person other than the prisoner-student. According to Freire, in prison or otherwise an education must be a process of liberation, "the means by which men and women deal critically and creatively with reality and discover how to participate in the transformation of their world" (Shaull, introduction to Freire 1970:15).

If post-secondary education in prison is to be an effective method of correctional treatment, therefore, it cannot be a prescribed form of education, for Freire emphasizes that "prescription represents the imposition of one man's choice upon another" (1970:31). For example, Duguid's method prescribes behaviour and thus very possibly prevents the prisoner-student from achieving true self-discovery. But "education must be a process of finding out who we really are and not a process of identifying with who our oppressors would want us to be" (Mullins 1985:77). This self-liberating aspect of Freire's pedagogy makes it particularly appealing to prisoner-students, for perhaps even more so than peasants, prisoners "feel like 'things' owned by the oppressor" (Freire 1970:51). Indeed, the 'impressive' number of prisoners

attracted to post-secondary education might be explained partially by the desire to overcome the feeling of being owned. In any case, Freire's pedagogy has proved emancipating among peasants throughout South America, and peasants and prisoners everywhere face problems that are fundamentally the same.

According to Duguid, the problems facing prisoners stem from their psychological deficiencies. Drawing upon the developmental model of human maturation ascribed to Lawrence Kohlberg, he sees prisoners as socially, morally, and cognitively retarded. Accordingly, his pedagogy begins with the assumption that "with prisoners, the normal maturation process has for some reason been interrupted, stalled, or retarded" (Duguid 1988:174). Conversely, Freire sees the problems of the powerless arising not from psychic deficiencies but from social ones. His philosophic position begins -much like that of Plato over two thousand years previous - with the somewhat simple observation that " the problem of humanization has always...been man's central problem" (Freire 1970:27). Thus Freire is chiefly concerned with expanding human consciousness and with applying the new awareness to changing both the individual and society - or the human condition - for the better. In comparison, Duguid's interests are perhaps Lilliputian, yet his concern with post-secondary education in prison provides much of the 'microanthropological' evidence crucial to a responsible study of the prison university as correctional treatment.

More important yet, Duguid's ultimate goals for education resemble those of Freire. Both see education in terms of empowerment rather than training and both

advocate a participatory model in which teachers and students act in concert to escape their history and forge a new one (Duguid 1988:179; Freire 1970:40). Any success of the prison university, even in the flawed perspective of 'recidivism', can be seen as resulting from similar factors. The ability of education to empower prisoner-students is by far the most important. An effective correctional treatment program must have the strength to impinge upon human development with the force necessary to cause a change despite formidable opposition by the status quo. Of course, education almost inevitably has an impact upon human development. But if a post-secondary prison education acts with sufficient force to empower prisoner-students to change themselves and eventually their world, it does so through the capacities of the humanities and the liberal Arts to illuminate "the reality of oppression, not as a closed world from which their is no exit, but as a limiting situation which they can transform" (Freire 1970:34).

Although Freire is mainly concerned with literacy, his model is contrary to mainstream approaches. According to Giroux, "he teaches people how to read so that they can decode and demythologize both their own cultural traditions as well as those that structure and legitimate the wider social order" (1988:153). While Duguid is mainly concerned with post-secondary education, he suggests that the prison university's objectives are similar: "a new vocabulary - a new literacy. And with this new vocabulary, as part of the liberal arts/humanities package, comes cultural literacy...and the option on a new world view" (1988:180). Most prisoners, in Canada

as elsewhwere, are the products of extreme poverty - the victims of not only disadvantaged economic environments, but of political, social, and economic domination. Furthermore, if they achieve 'cultural literacy', it is in spite of many of the same factors confronting the dispossessed of Latin America; that is, the struggle is in many ways the same (see: for a related observation, Shaull's introduction to Freire 1970:10). Consequently, while Freire might be relied upon to explain the struggle on a theoretical basis, Duguid and others can detail much of the day-to-day endeavours of the prisoner-students involved in it.

Giroux emphasizes that the strength of Freire's pedagogy rests with its ability to provide oppressed individuals everywhere with "the opportunity to give meaning and expression to their own needs and voices as part of a project of self- and social empowerment" (1988:153). Certainly, Duguid feels that this 'opportunity' is the forte of the prison university - at least as it is organized in British Columbia. Despite the problematic theoretical foundation of a program based on the initial premise that inadequate cognitive and moral development lead to criminal behaviour, the BC prison university program must be seen as having 'noble' aims (for example, MacLean 1992:24). Perhaps it has even achieved some of them. Ross and Fabiano declare that although effective treatment programs for adult offenders are "truly exceptional", the BC prison university program has been "exceptionally effective in reducing the recidivism of institutionalized adult offenders" (1981:1). Furthermore, the BC program "has been described as the most successful program of its kind in

North America" (Duguid 1981:148, citing Griffin 1978); see also Ross and Fabiano 1981).

CHAPTER TWO

THE BRITISH COLUMBIA PRISON UNIVERSITY PROGRAM

The BC prison university is one of the most researched correctional programs in the Canadian federal prison system, or Correctional Services of Canada (CSC). Educators at the University of Victoria (UVic) introduced a post-secondary educational program into British Columbia federal prisons in 1972. Simon Fraser University (SFU) assumed responsibility for its administration in the early 1980s. Certainly, it is the best organized prison university program in Canada, and perhaps in the Americas. In fact, few Canadian prisons even possess organized programs, as most federal facilities only allow prisoners to study at the post-secondary level by correspondence.

In "The Origins and Development of University Education at Matsqui Institution", Duguid proposes that the BC program "offers at least a potential model for prison education" (1983:307). A number of factors support its value as a prototype. Among the more important is its availability. Prisoners are often transferred, but since the same program exists in every federal prison in the province, a prisoner-student can be moved even frequently without having to abandon a particular course of study. Moreover, the program is always conducted in an area apart from the rest of the prison, where professors are able to lecture in classrooms much like they might at

SFU. However, the individual prison programs are not carbon copies of one another, as SFU hires staff to work only in a particular prison. "As a result, each program tend[s] to develop a style and image of its own dependent on the nature of the prison and the leadership exercised by the on-site staff" (Duguid 1983:296).

Since the BC prison university functions on a limited budget, the course curriculum is not large. The emphasis is on the humanities and the liberal arts. Although introductory courses are offered far more frequently than advanced level ones, prisoner-students are still able to earn degrees inside the prison. In fact, the first BA degree was awarded in 1977, and during the next four years a total of eight more BA degrees were granted to students graduating from the prison university (Duguid 1983:300). Some of the graduates were employed within the prison as tutors, giving them valuable experience in the work force prior to their release. Despite the positive aspects of the BC prison university program, however, it has been subjected to many criticisms, nearly all of them centering around the cognitive-moral development model upon which it is based (for example, MacLean 1992).

The theoretical framework of the BC program comes from Piaget's cognitive development studies and Kohlberg's attempts to link them with his work on moral development. The program's emphasis "was never on morality per se nor even on moral content, but on moral reasoning, the development through the cognitive growth implicit in higher education", especially of a liberal arts/humanities orientation (Duguid 1981:148). Duguid observes that the experience of Anthony Parlett, who

attempted to measure the cognitive and moral development of prisoners in William Head, a minimum security prison on Vancouver Island, resulted in the belief that attitude changes were best fostered by the humanities disciplines (1983:300). Parlett, a graduate student at UVic, wrote his PhD thesis on the subject, "The Development of Attitudes and Morality in Adult Offenders" (1974). He was very much involved with the initial organization of the program, although shortly after graduating he accepted "a position of some influence within the Correction Service of Canada" (Duguid 1983:297). Since Duguid does not elaborate on the nature of the 'influence', it is difficult to assess the extent to which Parlett's position with CSC might have contributed to the longevity of the BC program.

In any case, his contention that the humanities disciplines best foster attitude changes in prisoner-students might be true - or false - for students inside and outside of prison. The controversy revolves around the question of whether or not prisoner-students differ cognitively and/or morally from other adult students. Proponents of the BC program are 'developmentalists', thus maintaining that most prisoner-students are different solely because they have been convicted of a criminal offence. Conversely, 'environmentalists' or 'social learning theorists', including conventional cultural anthropologists, stress the homogeneity of the human species and the role of the environment in explaining human differences (see: Bates and Plog 1991:3).

However, notwithstanding their developmentalist disposition, both Duguid (1981:149) and Ross (1981:23-24) argue that the cognitive/moral development model

is able to incorporate the 'criminal as victim' perspective concerning the causes of criminal behaviour. Since the offender as victim approach loosely views criminal behaviour as the direct result of environmental influences, the developmentalists concede that the cause of cognitive/moral deficiencies might also come from socio-economic factors. However, in as much as the developmentalists admit that "[t]he theory, as elaborated by Piaget/Kohlberg, is based on a genetic approach to human development" (Duguid 1981:149), ascribing a social origin to cognitive and moral growth is simply an example of wishing to keep your cake and eat it too! If poor cognitive/moral development is indeed the result of socio-economic factors such as poverty, the absence of role models, inadequate schooling, and the like, then the developmentalist theory cannot also be "based on a genetic approach". But in any case, it is surely worth serious consideration that the successses attributed to the BC program might have been achieved in spite of its theoretical base rather than because of it.

In "An Evaluation of a Prison Education Program", Rick Linden reports that in addition to a marginal success in reducing recidivism the BC program (1) positively effected prisoner's skills, attitudes, and communication (2) contributed to a more stable prison environment , and (3) was effective educationally (see: Linden et al 1984:72). He says that the study, because it is comprised of pre-test and post-test data, "represents an improvement over most previous research in this area" (1984:66). Sixty-six prisoners participated, 33 in the experimental and 33 in the control group.

The experimental group participated in the educational program, which was composed of five months of intensive instruction at the introductory level in History and English, while the control group continued their normal prison routine. Both groups were extensively examined both before the educational period and after it. Moreover, eight years later, in 1980, records were obtained from the RCMP from which recidivism data were calculated.

Ayers et al used a similar approach to report on the effectiveness of the BC program to the Solicitor General in 1980 (study cited in MacLean 1992:24-26). They used an experimental group of 73 prisoners, who had completed at least two semesters, and attempted to produce a control group which was similar in all respects (such as age, length of sentence, type of offence) except participation in the prison educational program (MacLean 1992:24). Psychological testing revealed that the BC prison university program had a significant impact on both the cognitive and moral development of participants. Moreover, participation in the program seemed to contribute toward reduced rates of recidivism: only 14% of the experimental group were re-incarcerated, while 52% were re-incarcerated from the control group.

Duguid points out that many positive studies of this type were conducted during the early years of the program, "but formal testing and interviews gradually stopped in order not to 'contaminate' the program by emphasizing its rehabilitative or habilitative goals" (1983:301). Since the program began as an experiment, tests were

conducted initially in order to substantiate it as a viable form of correctional treatment. However, as the program matured, efforts increased to make it appear as simply a post-secondary educational program primarily designed to make university credits obtainable in prison. As Linden observes, "[w]hile the ultimate goal of the program was to use education as a means of rehabilitation, the most immediate goal was to provide the inmates with a university-level education" (1984:68). And few critics would argue that the BC prison university failed in that regard.

Even MacLean concedes that "the number of prisoners exposed to the program is really quite impressive" (1992:24). However, he criticizes the implications of the studies by inquiring "that with all this emphasis on the efficacy of the [BC] program to improve the level of moral development and thereby reduce the rate of recidivism, is anyone concerned with the value of education itself" (1992:26)? Although he admits that a properly constructed project such as the BC program can lead to markedly observable cognitive and moral development in prisoner-students, he is quick to add that such consequences do not necessarily translate into behavioural changes (1992:25-26). Furthermore, he points out that demonstrating an ability to avoid criminal behaviour is a poor indicator of academic achievement.

It is MacLean's view that post-secondary education in prison, once tied to the cognitive/moral approach and evaluated on its capacity to reduce recidivism, becomes 'first and foremost' a method of contributing to increasing social control

within the prison. Elaborating on this theme, Ray Jones explains that although post-secondary education programs are "flourishing in the prisons of Massachusetts", the prison authorities seem to have accepted the situation for reasons decidedly opposed to the pedagogical goals of the educators (1992:3-4). Jones' evidence indicates that prison administrators may simply see the prison university in the tired, old setting of punishment and security; for example, as a mechanism of social control or behaviour modification. Furthermore, the influence of the BC cognitive/moral model seems to have extended into even the Massachusetts prison system. Jones reports that the Massachusetts "curriculum rationale" has been heavily influenced by the philosophy "of Stephen Duguid, a Canadian educator who has attempted to advance theory supporting higher learning's reformative aims" (1992:12).

The evidence of Jones and MacLean, then, appears to contradict Duguid's contention that the 'success' and 'survival' of the BC prison university program depended on its ability to remain neutral in the environment of the prison - or to balance successfully the interests of the prisoners with those of the prison administration (Duguid 1983:302). They suggest that educational programs are allowed into the prison primarily because of their value as administrative tools. And at least the survival of the program in many instances does seem to depend upon its capacity to lend itself to administrative objectives that appear entirely unrelated to pedagogical goals.

Nevertheless, while matters relating to such administrative concerns as security,

social control, and punishment are nearly always opposed to the interests of prisoners, the university program does offer other resources that are beneficial to the entire prison population. For example, prisoner-students tend to assist the general population by serving as representatives during meetings with the administration, by helping with legal matters, and by making university facilities such as paper, books, and the photo-copier available for general use (Duguid 1983:303). The riot in Matsqui prison (June second to June fifth, 1981) perhaps best illustrates the nature of the general population's regard for the university program. The Academic Centre and the university library were the only areas that rioting prisoners did not attempt to destroy (see: Whetstone 1981:92-93; Duguid 1983:306). Accordingly, and despite the evidence of Jones and MacLean, perhaps the success of the prison university does depend upon balancing successfully both the concerns of administrators and prisoners.

Although the BC program, particularly as it functioned within the penitentiary at Matsqui, has been presented as the prototypical model for post-secondary education in prison, it has not been adopted in Canadian prisons outside of the province. In an overview of "The Nature of Education Within Canadian Federal Prisons", Bill McCarthy alleges that, other than the BC program, post-secondary education is unorganized, only 'half-heartedly' supported by CSC, and distinguished by curricula embodying "mostly versions of adult basic education rather than college level courses" (1985:450). The latter allegation might be exaggerated, since a number of

accredited Canadian universities, including Queens, Waterloo, Manitoba, and Athabasca, offer correspondence courses to qualified prisoners in various prisons. However, McCarthy's other claims seem to be more than justified by the existing evidence.

CSC AND THE PRISON UNIVERSITY PROGRAM

If poverty is the mother of crime, want of sense is the father. -Bruyere-

CSC is divided into five regions (British Columbia, Prairies, Ontario, Quebec, and Maritimes). The format of the prison university program in each region differs, for each region approaches the problem of providing post-secondary education to prisoners in a different manner. Moreover, excluding British Columbia, in each case the problems of program development have precluded the establishment of anything but a rudimentary program. Programs even differ between prisons in the same region. However, if a common factor exists, it can be found in the statement of principles concerning post-secondary education in federal prisons issued by the Solicitor General in 1984.

Although his statement has been criticized for its failure to address concerns regarding the lack of an over-all national policy (see: McCarthy 1985:450-51), it did declare that the CSC should govern all prison education, including the prison

university. It also directed that prisoners wishing to participate in a post-secondary program should be required to contribute financially towards the cost of the program. But since it neglected to stipulate the amount of the 'contribution', each region determines it arbitrarily. McCarthy concludes that, no matter the amount, the "revised program, which requires inmates to pay for their education, will not improve the status or quality of education within the penal system" (1985:451).

In the penitentiary, prisoners are paid between $3 and $7 a day to perform their designated tasks. Most find this sum to be less than they require for 'necessities' such as stationery, toiletries, and tobacco. Furthermore, forcing prisoners to pay for their education not only discourages potential students because of the program cost and the prisoners' imposed poverty. By charging a fee for admission, the prison university is made to appear as an "elitist extra" rather than simply another job designation such as the laundry, kitchen, and vocational shops, where prisoners also participate in training, or educational, programs.

Outside of BC, most prisoner-students involved in university studies work in their cells at correspondence-based courses. They often remain near the bottom of the prison pay-scale, which is rated on seniority and performance, since they lack an immediate, CSC employed supervisor (see: McCarthy 1985:446). Although the prison university in BC attracts about 20% of the prisoner population (see: Duguid 1983:258), McCarthy alleges that disorganization and discrimination in the other regions have contributed to a lack of participation in educational programs of any

type. In fact, he claims that CSC's "lack of enthusiasm for education has invariably pushed inmates further away from learning than they were upon entering the system" (1985:446). The prisoners' negativity can be attributed directly to the failure of CSC to promote or fund post-secondary educational programs within the prisons (see: McCarthy 1985:446). But is CSC entirely accountable? The relative success and longevity of the BC program appears to indicate otherwise, for the BC region must operate according to the same directives as, for example, the Prairies or Ontario. The BC program was founded (and to some extent is maintained) by an incredibly determined, hard working, and diplomatic clique of academics. The same clique of dedicated educators is responsible for the program's dissemination throughout, at least, much of the Americas. While I cannot identify all the members of this group, certainly Parlett, Ayers, and especially Duguid belong. Jones observes that "Barker, Duguid, Germanotta, and others involved in Massachusetts prison education are friends and colleagues...frequently in contact, and have collaborated in the preparation of lectures and presentations for a variety of regional, national, and international conferences" (1992:13). While the BC-based academics might be lauded for their work in the field of prison education, then, academics based in the other regions might be questioned concerning their delinquency.

In the introduction to The American Prison, Goodstein and MacKenzie suggest that the public's sentiments toward crime and punishment are invariably reflected in the policies of prisons (1989:1-10). Consequently, perhaps the public's retributive

attitude is somewhat to blame for program problems, thus reducing any responsibility by the academic community for the disorganization of prison post-secondary educational programs outside of the BC region. The BC program began and was well established before the middle nineteen seventies, when the public's sentiments changed from a general belief in the rehabilitative ideal to an attitude of increasing conservatism and punitiveness (see: Goodstein and MacKenzie 1989:4-6). A number of prison university programs have been founded, with varying degrees of effectiveness, since. For example, a group of Manitoba-based academics has persistently tried to establish an organized university within the federal penitentiary at Stony Mountain, with little success. Although they have managed to offer lecture-delivered classes on a semester basis almost every year since the early-nineteen seventies, the program is still best characterized by insecurity, uncertainty, and general disorganization (interviews with prisoner-students). Therefore, the evidence appears to indicate that the establishment of an efficient and effective prison university program is prevented chiefly, not by academic delinquency, but by the punitive attitude of the public as mirrored by policies of CSC.

Despite the low regard with which the CSC holds post-secondary education, a number of sources suggest that a positive relationship exists between organized prison university programs and better methods of institutional management. For example, DiIulio says that "[m]ost prison and jail administrators strongly believe that making a wide range of meaningful program opportunities available to inmates is a

necessary...condition for running prisons and jails in an orderly, cost-effective manner" (1991:114). Linden et al add that some prison administrators consider that post-secondary educational programs, in particular, tend to act as stabilizing agents on the prison (1984:71-72). Because of their commitment to their studies, most prisoner-students have little time to pursue such popular (and illegal) prison pastimes as gambling and drinking home-brew. The majority of prisoners participating in the prison university had better disciplinary records after involving themselves in the program than they had before (Linden 1984:72). Furthermore, educational activities create information about prisoner-students which makes them increasingly vulnerable to the evaluations of prison administrators, classification officers, and parole workers. And such surveillance data can be a valuable weapon used by prison administrators in their unceasing efforts to control prisoners (see: Witherspoon, cited in MacLean 1992:27).

In spite of the numerous potential administrative benefits associated with the establishment of prison university programs, moreover, most CSC officials still consider post-secondary education to be generally incompatible with the Service's position on both the purpose of education and the abilities of prisoners (see: McCarthy 1985:446-48). The CSC emphasizes training rather than education. In support of this position, correctional officials present an 'economical' view of society in which the principle causes of crime are unemployment and poverty. The CSC's purpose for education is to train prisoners to become productive members of society

- and to accept their roles as producers. Therefore, the economist's view of society also promotes an hierarchical view in which the classes are structured with most prisoners found occupying the lowest level -the 'producing' or the 'working' class. Furthermore, since "officials not only see the inmates' level of development as socially and academically inferior, but also accept these characteristics as permanent aspects of the inmates' character...education [as opposed to training] is seen as having limited value" (McCarthy 1985:447). This rationale encourages the teaching of skills beneficial to working class occupations and discourages the teaching of humanities subjects that promote critical thinking abilities and personal development (for a related discussion, McCarthy 1985:446-48). Nevertheless, a remarkable number of prisoners continue to pursue post-secondary studies and some use the prison university to effect remarkable reformulations of their characters. Whetstone suggests that, while the convict 'code' ordinarily stigmatizes any behaviour even remotely oriented toward rehabilitation, participation in the prison university is considered to be a good way to 'do time'(1981:82-84). Duguid supports his observation, pointing out that "[a]ny prisoner could join the program and not be accused of 'copping out' to rehabilitation" (1983:302). Consequently, the prison university is perhaps the sole 'treatment' program in which prisoners can sincerely participate without attracting the contempt of those professing allegiance to the code. This fact might account partially for the propensity of chronic recidivists to involve themselves in post-secondary endeavours (see: Fabiano and Ross 1981:2), an issue

which, of course, clouds the evidence concerning the effectiveness of the prison university as a method of correctional treatment.

In any case, the fact that participation in the prison university is not viewed as 'copping out' plays an important role in the program's continuing popularity within the prison. Prisoners can get involved without fear of tarnishing their reputation. One of the first prisoners to graduate from Kent (the maximum security penitentiary in the BC region) Thomas Elton, pointed out in his Valedictorian Address that "everyone"involved in the university program was accorded some degree of respect beyond the usual (see: Elton 1986:139). Elton added that "[t]o survive, the Program has to be a refuge...a place that is not part of the prison...a sanctuary" (1986:139). And according to Whetstone, "[e]ducation initially entered into as an escape from prison is often taken back into the prison community as a positive force by the same individual" (1981:89). Ultimately, of course, some individuals take this 'positive force' back into communities outside of the prison, evidence further clouding the recidivism perspective on program effectiveness.

CORRESPONDENCE STUDIES COMPARED TO THE CLASSROOM

Comparing the BC prison university program to post-secondary education in the other regions governed by CSC, inevitably entails a discussion concerning the relative merits of the classroom and the correspondence approach. Certainly, the classroom,

or the lecture-delivered program has obvious advantages. It allows for student teacher interaction and classroom discussion, both activities that promote better communication abilities and, perhaps, contribute to a generally larger perspective from which to view society and social problems. Conversely, while the personal character of correspondence oriented studies surely imposes a narrower focus upon education as a whole, it possesses a number of advantages peculiar to a prison education . For example, it impedes efforts to use the educational process as a means to create information about prisoner-students. Furthermore, it keeps the university essentially powerless in all but academic concerns, an issue Duguid considers "to be absolutely central" to the maintenance of an objective, or unbiased, position between staff and prisoners" (see: 1983:298-99). A correspondence-based program also allows much more latitude in curriculum options, an advantage that ultimately contributes to a number of other, perhaps somewhat 'hidden' benefits.

For example, Athabasca University (AU) is a fully accredited institution that operates entirely as a correspondence-based university. Admission as an adult student does not require a high-school diploma (as is also the case at Queens, Waterloo, and Guelph, the other major universities offering large, correspondence-delivered curricula). Prisoner-students can choose from among hundreds of courses in Humanities, Liberal Arts, Business Administration, and Science. Conversely, prisoners participating in prison university programs operating with a lecture-based format, in classrooms, have a very restricted curriculum, a source of many complaints

(for examples, Duguid 1983:301-02; Rivera 1992:29-34; Bell 1992:39).

The correspondence program's larger curriculum, combined with its impersonality, also attracts the inexperienced, uncommitted, and less confident type of prisoner who might have been repelled by a limited, traditional curriculum and/or a classroom setting (see: Whetstone 1981:79-94). Some of these prisoner-students, once exposed to post-secondary studies, become capable scholars who are eager to learn in most situations. Donald Tracy (pseudonym) is perhaps typical. A thirty-five year old, three time loser, he started correspondence studies with AU to test himself, since he had not completed high-school. Initially, he approached his studies 'like a hobby', but after successfully completing several courses he began to study as a full-time student. By the time of his release, some four years after enrolling, he was only a few credits short of graduating - an objective he accomplished 'on the street' (personal observation and interviews).

Of course, the classroom has the obvious advantage of being able to 'shut out' the prison, at least for a number of hours. Whetstone indicates that the atmosphere in the 'university area' was what initially attracted him to the program (1981:81). Like Tracy, he was a multiple-loser who eventually earned a degree, an achievement he describes in "How the Prisoner Sees Education" (1981). Obviously, both classroom and correspondence formats have certain advantages. An ideal mode of delivery might involve both approaches, and in this sense it is notable that some prisoners continue to study by correspondence even while participating in a classroom oriented

program. In any case, particular modes of delivery are of lesser importance than educational objectives.

THE PURPOSE OF PRISON EDUCATION

Thought takes man out of servitude, into freedom. -Longfellow-

Just as Freire emphasizes the need for humans to 'see' and 'act' (1970:19-20), Professor H. Savage stresses that the primary goal of education, inside of prison or out, is to ensure that individuals are treated as "if they were autonomous, choosing human beings who are searching for meaning" (1974:183). However, rather than follow this precept, Savage points out that prison education programs tend to concentrate on formal requirements and rigid, uncompromising curricula. A professor of educational psychology at the University of Saskatchewan, Savage is a long-time observer of prison education and its effects. He says that the purpose of education is not to meet the prescriptions of society or any of its institutions, but to fulfill the needs of the learner. "It may be much more important for [the prisoner-student] to learn things which are not on any formal curriculum than it is to learn things that are on the curriculum that is now prescribed by our formal educational organizations" (Savage 1974:183).

Although Savage's contention is no doubt controversial, it is not inconsistent with

the participatory model advocated by both Duguid and Freire (see: 15-16). However, in Justice, Morality, and Education, Les Brown defines the purpose of education as "the developing of individual potentialities consistent with social values" (1985:4, emphasis in original), and his definition is not unpopular. The phrase 'consistent with social values' is, of course, superfluous according to Savage's notions. Furthermore, it reflects the use of education as a device to reproduce the existing social order, which is the tradition that moved Giroux to seek a radical pedagogy capable of separating 'social justice' from the control of the dominant class (Giroux 1988:215). Too often, 'social values' represent the wishes of the powerful, although they are manifested by the actions of the state (for example, Barak 1991). Therefore, to arbitrarily coordinate educational objectives with social values is both an ethically questionable procedure and a poor teaching strategy.

In his introduction to Freire, Shaull observes:

> There is no such thing as a neutral educational process. Education either functions as an instrument which is used to facilitate the integration of the younger generation into the logic of the present system and bring about conformity to it,

which is the process that Giroux and Freire vehemently oppose,

> or it becomes 'the practice of freedom'; the means by which men and women deal critically and creatively with reality and discover how to participate in the transformation of their world (see: Freire 1970:15).

The latter tactic is the educational objective suggested by Freire's Pedagogy of the

Oppressed (1970), and it is particularly pertinent to prisoners because they often perceive the environment differently from those responsible for society's social values - and legal sanctions (Fabiano and Ross 1981:81-83). While a number of sources infer from this latter observation that prisoners lack certain cognitive and perhaps moral abilities (see: Fabiano and Ross 1981:81-83; Duguid 1988:174-80), Freire suggests - if prisoners are included among the oppressed - that they simply lack the means to change their environments for the better. In other words, they 'see' things differently because things are different. Further, in order to become involved personally in any attempt to facilitate their educational objectives, "it is necessary to trust in the oppressed and in their ability to reason" (Freire 1970:53).

The CSC obviously does not recognize this necessity. Educational programs, particularly at the post-secondary level, are handicapped because of the Service's negative views concerning the academic abilities of prisoners, or of prisoners' ability to reason (for example, McCarthy 1985:446-47). This negative outlook contributes to the Service's policy of attempting to train prisoners rather than educate them, a policy consistent with an overall educational objective pointed toward replicating the existing system and its values, and a policy that has largely ignored the subject of post-secondary education altogether. But since the policies of CSC are chiefly the products of public opinion, perhaps the public, itself, must be informed concerning the nature of effective correctional treatment in order to effect a positive change. At the National Conference on Prison Education, in 1981, Arnold Edinborough said

that "the biggest problem" facing educators concerned with establishing a successful prison university program "is the education of the public"... . If we educate the public, we will then be able, unobstructed, to educate in the prisons" (1981:34-35).

And what better way to educate the public about higher learning in prison than to release prisoners who are capable of demonstrating its positive effects by their conduct in society? Of course, positive or negative, its effects are not readily demonstrable. Nevertheless, a number of individuals have used prison university programs to launch successful careers in the arts, law, journalism, social work, and numerous other professional and non-professional categories. Their achievements can serve at once as examples to the public and to other prisoners.

In fact, as a response to what he terms the "constant negativism" directed towards prison rehabilitation programs, Salah-EL lists an impressive array of individuals and their accomplishments which he hopes might inspire other prisoners to capitalize on the "opportunity" of education (1992:45-52). Salah-EL's article appears in the Journal of Prisoners on Prisons, in an issue devoted entirely to the subject of post-secondary education, an event that is in itself somewhat inspirational and certainly indicative of the prison university's increasing significance. In his editorial note introducing the issue, Howard Davidson says that the "popularity of prison education among prisoners...is unequaled when compared to other prison programs" (1992:1). He explains that the issue on prison education is an attempt to allow prisoners and former prisoners the opportunity to voice their concerns about educational programs

(other than criminologists and prison activists, they are the sole contributors to the journal).

Not surprisingly, the prisoners, many of whom are themselves involved in post-secondary programs, have a great deal to say about the purpose of prison education. The consensus of their opinion is that education does not have to be directed primarily toward the rehabilitation of offenders in order to be a meaningful, positive force on their lives. While the articles are generally supportive of existing prison education, they describe from the perspective of the prisoner-students a hodge-podge of loosely organized programs - all handicapped by an inescapable struggle between the opposing interests of educators and correctional authorities. For example, Jones says that "[e]ntry into the prison milieu transforms the fundamental character of education". Moreover, he warns that "[a]s prison higher education programs become increasingly integrated within corrections, there is a danger that they are becoming complicit in a process that has historically done little but degrade and defile" (1992:17).

The unorganized nature of most Canadian prison university programs, excluding the BC region, perhaps allows them to escape the perils of becoming part of the correctional enterprise. (The BC region tries to combat the problem through the creation of an 'alternate community'.) In any case, Jones advises that one of the principle problems the prison university must solve is its tendency towards collusion with the penal apparatus (see: 1992:17). Duguid also recognizes this phenomenon,

and suggests that to avoid it the university program staff must remain absolutely non-partisan. "They must not carry keys, must not take the institutional count, and must not sit on prison committees" (Duguid 1983:299). He says that it is essential for prisoners to think of the program as just a university, and not as treatment. This makes it easier for prisoners to think of themselves as students, which is, of course, the first step towards acting as students. As the labelling tradition observes, self-image is a powerful determinant of behaviour (see: Becker 1971), and environmental influences often cause prisoners to think of themselves in personally satisfying rather than socially satisfying roles (see: Duguid 1988:175-76).

THE STUDENT BODY

Although Duguid maintains a developmentalist position, holding that most prisoners have not matured normally, he acknowledges that many educators think "prisoners are just like other adult students" and "education programs in prison [should be] just like education programs in schools and colleges" (1988:174). While this might be accurate in terms of development and structure, demographic data suggest that the Canadian prison population is hardly representative of the general population. Men, the poor, and certain minority groups are all over-represented. Attempts to determine the composition of the prison population, from which the student body is drawn, will have to account for this fact.

For example, while Aboriginal people constitute only 4% of the general population, they are nearly 12% of federal prisoners (Nielsen 1992:3-4). Moreover, they comprise nearly 50% of the prisoners in Stony Mountain, the only federal penitentiary in Manitoba, and they make up more than a third of the prisoners in the Prairies Region (Morse 1992:56). In terms of the of the prison university, this population profile suggests that some attempts must be made to develop a 'non-traditional approach' in the curriculum. A non-traditional curriculum in this case recognizes an Aboriginal perspective and the fact "that there are socio-economic conditions, in addition to the individual's behavior, that cause a person to commit a crime" (Rivera 1992:30). Furthermore, this approach allows prisoners to understand themselves relative to their particular communities, a process that Rivera says can defeat "the feeling of powerlessness which keeps us from doing something about our present conditions" (1992:32).

Of course, this type of evidence makes identification of the potential student body important. Recall that one aspect associated with successful correctional treatment is program/offender matching, and the non-traditional curriculum approach might provide that for prison post-secondary educational programs. However, while certain facts about prisoner populations might provide information concerning valuable curriculum options, a cross-section of the prison population is not necessarily indicative of the prison student body. Both Ross (1981:2-3) and Whetstone (1981:80) observe that a large number of students involved in the prison university seem to be

older, multiple recidivists with serious behavioural problems including substance abuse. Furthermore, Duguid concludes that a cross-section of the prison population is "too crude a device" to provide an accurate picture of the collective student body (1988:175).

He prefers to look at prisoner-students, first, as criminals and then in the "three ways the criminal has been portrayed in much popular, political, and academic literature: decision maker, bandit, and victim" (emphasis in original, 1988:175). Duguid and the rest of the developmentalist school prefer to think of the criminal as a responsible decision maker. They argue that most criminals simply make bad decisions. This school of thought places the individual in control, not social forces or economic conditions, and the approach reduces the discourse to the old philosophical battle between free will and determinism. The victim, of course, is just the opposite of the decision maker, driven to crime by circumstances entirely beyond individual control. Clarence Darrow believed criminals were victims, "arguing that: I do not believe that people are in jail because they deserve to be. They are in jail simply...on account of circumstances...for which they are in no way responsible" (quoted in Duguid 1988:176).

Although there is likely some truth in all of these descriptions, the bandit, or the outlaw, is the self-image most prisoners have of themselves. These are the prisoners who adhere to the 'convict code', and to whom society's values are a poor second to those of a particular group, gang, or subculture such as the underworld or the drug

world. Consequently, the prison student body can be thought of as being largely composed of individuals who think of themselves in the colourful and romantic sense of outlaws - twentieth century Robin Hoods, so to speak. Although Duguid proposes that to affect this group "there must be a frontal assault on an entire world view, a challenge to basic assumptions, and perhaps contact at a very personal level" (1988:176), results of the prison university program suggest that these objectives can be accomplished.

Of course, the argument centers around 'how'. Certainly the numerous and complex problems exhibited by the prison population leads to the conclusion that no single educational approach can address them adequately. Duguid reports that a biographical study of BC prison university students disclosed that on average their first conviction was at fourteen, and afterwards their lives were characterized by regular arrests, court appearances, and prison terms (see: 1988:176). Obviously, this behaviour cannot change until mechanisms are provided to make change possible - and the prison university has provided some of these mechanisms. For example, while employed by CSC in 1981 Parlett was asked to evaluate the effects of advanced learning on prisoners. He concluded that, at the very least, "education at an advanced level changes subjects to a more analytic mode of perception"and he ended his report with the observation that "[t]here are also clear indications that criminality may be caused to diminish" (1981:111).

THE EFFECTS OF POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION IN PRISON

A penny spent in teaching will save a pound in punishing. -Dickens-

Of course, the effects of the prison university are basically what I am trying to establish in this thesis. Certainly, higher learning does not automatically, or mechanically, make one a better person. Neither does going to prison. However, both experiences undeniably will contribute towards human development.

In a paper presented to the World Congress in Education, Morgan Lewis argues that no firm evidence exists "that any type of prison treatment influences behaviour after release" (1981:131), which is the argument presented by most proponents of the proposition that rehabilitation is impossible in a prison environment. He concedes, though, that if the prison provides opportunities for treatment, some prisoners will take advantage of them. But he adds that the environments to which they will return upon release will in most cases 'overwhelm' even the positive effects of the prison experience (see: 1981:130-32). Thus, the ideal effect of the prison university, as a number of sources point out, would be to begin releasing prisoners who were mentally prepared to struggle with their environments and change them for the better (for a theoretical example, Freire 1970:31-32; and for a more practical observation, Rivera 1992:32).

Unfortunately, little evidence exists that such an ideal state is being realized. It

was suggested nearly thirty years ago that "many of those rehabilitated in our correctional programs are the best...candidates for public employment, particularly where [it] is directed toward eradicating the very social injustices which contributed to their own downfall" (Mueller 1968:360). Although numerous prisoners attempt to prepare themselves for this type of employment by participating in post-secondary educational programs, only a few ex-prisoners are working, for example, within the criminal justice system or in the therapeutic community. While CSC maintains a halfway-house on the university campus for prisoners attending Simon Fraser, almost no organized efforts have been made, by any agency, to help students of the prison university after their release. The fact that ex-prisoner-students, themselves, have not organized such a project, however, is perhaps in some manner indicative of the program's undeveloped status.

Although no signs yet exist of organized post-release programs for prison university students, some signs indicate that the community is beginning to experience the effects of prison university programs and students. For example, Frank Guiney, a multiple recidivist, ex-heroin addict, and one of the first prisoners to graduate from the program at Matsqui, started a Learning Center at the Carnegie Community Hall, right in the heart of downtown Vancouver (Guiney 1986:258-63). He says that for "a significant proportion of the Downtown Eastside population...the notion of ever doing university-level work was...a far-fetched notion indeed" (1986:261). But he reports that several 'graduates' of the program are now attending Simon Fraser and

even more are employed at occupations gained as a result of their work at the Learning Center.

Guiney is truly participating in the 'transformation' of his community. Another project that might contribute to a transformation of a different sort is the Prison Journal started by prisoners participating in the BC university program (see: Duelli and Butt 1986:283). The Journal is intended to inform the public about prisons, prisoners, and rehabilitation, thereby educating the public concerning the true nature of crime and criminals - and in the process, perhaps transforming public opinion more to the 'pro' side of prisoners. The Theatre Group, started by the prison university at William Head, attempts to do likewise, but in an unstated and subtle manner. Although the Group's productions are staged at the prison, seats are available to the public and even the intimidating environment has not prevented performances from being 'sold out' (see: Johnston 1986:170). It is these kinds of projects that, ultimately, might ensure the prison university's success in the sense that it is only "through transforming action" that humans "can create a new situation" (Freire 1970:32). And perhaps the results of these projects are the first glimmers of such a consequence.

CHAPTER THREE

EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Of course Freire realizes that "[t]o surmount the situation of oppression", in the first place, humans must "critically recognize its causes" (1970:31-32). In that sense, the first job of the prison university is to teach prisoners how to deal 'critically and creatively' with reality. Duguid (1988), Ayers (1981), Parlett (1981), and the developmentalist school in general, insist that a liberal arts/humanities orientation can best achieve this goal. Such a perspective enables the student to develop critical thinking skills while examining complex social issues of a type not usually encountered in prison - or in the environments from which most prisoners come. In this sense, Freire observes that "[k]nowledge emerges only through...the restless, impatient, continuing, hopeful inquiry men pursue in the world, with the world, and with each other" (1970:58).

However, Jones criticizes the liberal arts/humanities perspective on the grounds that its claims to promote critical thinking abilities and, in general, rehabilitation have not been empirically verified "convincingly" (1992:17, my emphasis). He suggests that the prison university's "reluctance to deliver more technical or skill-based curricula may be merely a matter of habit and politics" (1992:17). But even if he is right, he is not considering the 'reality' of the situation. In pursuing an

expanded curriculum, he is not considering that prison universities everywhere are subject to correctional budgets. Money for rehabilitation oriented programs, in this 'Era of Retribution', is difficult to secure (see: Travis et al 1992:28-29). And if he is suggesting that skill-based courses replace the existing humanities oriented ones, isn't he in fact advocating training as opposed to education?

Professor Lucien Morin, the editor of On Prison Education (1981), offers some insight into this aspect of the prison university. He emphasizes education as human development; 'development' in the sense that both Sartre and Freire see humans "as beings in the process of becoming, as unfinished, uncompleted beings in and with a likewise unfinished reality" (Freire 1970:72). Morin calls the skill-based, or training, approach to education the "learn-how-to-do philosophy", and observes that it "all but snears at the 'learn-how-to-be' conception of human development" (1981:31). Moreover, Morin points out that training in practical know-how, or logic, might make prisoners good mechanics, or even good logicians, but it does very little towards contributing to their development as good human beings.

Similarly, in his description of "Penitentiary Education in Canada" (1981), J.W.Cosman, an employee of CSC, cautions against treating a human approach to education as secondary to a training approach (1981:39). He recognizes that "[e]ven academic education in penitentiaries is largely a matter of skill-training", rather than "development of the powers of intellect ...and the strengthening of reasoning" (1981:40). Consequently, he advocates the adoption of an educational strategy based

on a cognitive/moral deficiency model similar to that of the developmentalists. But Cosman perceptively points out an even more crucial threat to the future of the prison university than might be presented by the adoption of an inadequate approach to education. He proposes that "there is a serious risk that it will not receive the attention it deserves", and the evidence seems to indicate that Cosman is right.

THE PRISON UNIVERSITY AS EFFECTIVE CORRECTIONAL TREATMENT

The education of the prisoner is for the authorities both an indispensible precaution in the interests of society and an obligation to the prisoner. -Foucault-

Post-secondary education in prison, along with the Medical Model and the concept of rehabilitation in general, is certainly not receiving the favourable attention that it did before, roughly, the early-nineteen eighties. Duguid observes that giving prisoners a free education, "especially at the university level, [was never] an inherently popular idea in government or among the general public - quite the opposite" (Duguid and Hoekema 1986:2). However, the educators involved in, particularly, the BC prison university program, through an arduous research and publication effort culminating in 1981 with the National Conference on Prison Education at UVic, demonstrated to academicians and politicians alike that the prison university could be an effective method of correctional treatment.

Nevertheless, as Duguid puts it, "the bottom seemed to drop out" of post-secondary education in Canadian prisons after January, 1983, when the federal government announced its intentions to cancel all prison university programs (Duguid and Hoekema 1986:5).

'Cost saving measures' were cited as the basis for the decision. But in response to a massive lobbying campaign initiated by prisoner-students nationally, the government finally agreed to a compromise and the program was only amended to make prisoners pay a portion of their tuition. Nevertheless, the process took eighteen months, and the prison university program never regained its former status as an effective method of correctional treatment. Of course, its decline cannot be attributed solely to the government's threat to cancel the program; that is, it cannot be considered in isolation from contemporary social factors such as the retributive focus of public opinion and the increasing lack of faith in any form of correctional treatment based on a rehabilitative ideology (see: for example, Travis et al 1992:26-29).

In any event, the program's status, or how it is perceived by the public, has little to do with its validity. Public opinion can often be formed as a result of emotional rather than logical processes, but it is nevertheless a powerful determinant of goverment policy, certainly capable of influencing the effectiveness of correctional treatment by influencing political policies such as those affecting the allocation of funding. While public opinion might in this manner be retarding the progress of

post-secondary educational programs in prisons today, these programs remain as valid as they were before 'the bottom dropped out' in 1983. In the words of Duguid and Hoekema (1986:5), the prison university was the subject of "several years of praise, international recognition, proven cost-effectiveness, and good relations" before the federal governors inexplicably announced their intentions to 'axe' every post-secondary prison educational program in the nation (see for example, 1986:5). Thus, logic and evidence indicates that the prison university is potentially just as effective an approach to correctional treatment now as it ever was, despite the public's opinion.

Indeed, the main reason for the prison university's potential to succeed as an agent of correctional treatment is straightforward. A good number of prisoners are denied access to advanced forms of education because of the environment of their upbringing. But they are able to avail themselves of the opportunity to participate in the university when they are imprisoned, and the effect of their participation sometimes approximates a 'normal' post-secondary educational experience. Consequently, as Professor Peter Scharf argued before the World Congress in Education (1981), the educator's responsibility "is not simply to create an educational prison program for some psychological aim directed at the inmates", but to restore the balance of educational opportunities in society by "the creation of a broad, humanistic education for the prison inmate" (1981:231).

Ensuring that a prison education becomes a 'right' serves a two-fold purpose. On

the one hand it begins to address one of the fundamental problems of a free enterprise, or capitalistic, system: the unequal distribution of valuable social goods, one of which is education. On the other, it promotes the use of the prison as a mechanism of behavioural change, utilizing education as the causal antecedent making it possible. Moreover, in terms of correctional treatment, notice that Scharf's argument makes the effectiveness of post-secondary education in prison a non-issue. The issue becomes one pertaining to the application and balancing of prisoners' rights.

EDUCATION AS A RIGHT

There is a surprising amount of support for the argument that prisoners have a 'right' to be educated. For example, The United Nations' Declaration of Human Rights says that all persons are entitled to an education; and in Canada, the Penitentiary Act, says that "the Commissioner shall, so far as it is practicable make available to each inmate who is capable of benefiting therefrom, academic or vocational training" (see: McCarthy 1985:441-42). In addition, Foucault observes that the prisoners' right to education is among the seven principles that "for the past 150 years...have constituted the...maxims of the good 'penitential condition'" (1979:269-70). Nevertheless, while Cullen and Gilbert point out that it is tempting to argue from a premise that education is a right, they caution that an "emphasis on rights"

sometimes threatens to replace an "emphasis on caring" (1992:278).

They are 'firmly' against any movement towards abandoning rehabilitation in order to seek justice, and they point out that such a situation too often results from attempts to seek additional prisoners' rights (see: Cullen and Gilbert 1992:278-79). In any case, they recognize that the prisoners' rights perspective is a 'two-edged sword'. While rights unquestionably offer prisoners some protection, they also limit it to a degree that is much too dependent on contemporary opinion concerning the issue - a troubling prospect today, "[w]ith the prisoners' rights movements suffering significant defeats in the courts" (Cullen and Gilbert 1992:279). In light of this, making post-secondary education in prison exclusively a matter of rights might make the prison university subject to judicial interventions that could well result in the imposition of needless constraints, restrictions, and bureaucratic red-tape. Recall the importance of keeping the prison university program free from appearing as any part of the judicial apparatus.

This is not to suggest that the notion of education as a right should be dismissed. Certainly, the advantages of such a concept are too many and great. The sensible, middle-course seems to be that the advantages attendant with education as a right - especially the redistribution of educational opportunities and the enhanced use of prison as a mechanism of behavioural change - should be emphasized, while the extremes associated with the prisoners' rights perspective should be avoided. The proper forum is academic rather than legal. Arguing in the same way, Scharf

observes that "educational reform should be conceived of in terms of a theory of justice rather than as an aspect of a psychological theory of prisoner reform" (1981:243).

He points out that educators using a cognitive/moral approach "have confused means with ends" (1981:231). While Duguid, for example, sees the prison university as a means of promoting change in prisoners, Scharf sees it as an end in itself - social justice. He argues "that a prisoner can reasonably expect a quality education to be his due in a democratic and just society" (1981:231). Of course, methods must be established to improve the way that the prison university experience approximates the wider experience of a post-secondary education experience in general. If a true redistribution of educational opportunities is to be accomplished, the two experiences at least should be similar. Educators looking at the prison university from this perspective can argue that prisoners have a right to not only an education, but an education of certain standards and quality.

SOCIAL JUSTICE OR SOCIAL CONTROL

In fact, the entire concept of post-secondary education in prison can be better justified in the sense of social justice than in the sense of social control. Although the prison university appears to contribute towards a number of social controls which may lead to reduced rates of recidivism, better institutional environments, and the

generally positive attitudinal change expressed by program-participants, a case might be made for its preservation on the grounds of social justice alone. For example, Rawls has long argued for a definition, or theory, of justice based on a social contract stating that social penalties can be imposed only when it benefits the least advantaged individuals as well as the most advantaged (see: Scharf 1981:238-39). Social rights are retained by prisoners unless they so disrupt the general welfare that even a reasonable prisoner might agree to their suspension. Consequently, prisoners retain most of their rights, and according to Rawls equal access to education is a fundamental social right of all citizens, including prisoners (see: Scharf 1981:232-242).

Furthermore, if a correctional treatment program can be justified on the grounds of social justice, such as the prison university, it might attract a more genuinely interested portion of the prison population than a treatment program which cannot, such as various prison-based group counselling programs, psychiatric procedures, and addiction therapies. The prison university almost compels, if not sincere participation, at least participation to such an extent that it sometimes enkindles sincerity (for example, Whetstone 1981:83-85). It is almost impossible for a prisoner-student to do well at a post-secondary educational program without some genuine interest in the course content. Therefore, it is much more difficult to use the university program to feign reform, one of the salient shortcomings of the rehabilitative approach (Travis et al 1992:237).

While there seems to be little doubt that the prison university is rehabilitative, at least in the sense that 'rehabilitation' is generally used, considerable doubt exists whether it is truly a part of the rehabilitative approach to correctional treatment (see: Morin 1981; Travis et al 1992:especially 236-37). Certainly, prison post-secondary educational programs do not conform to the 'Medical Model', the approach which characterizes programs complying with the rehabilitative ideal. In terms of correctional treatment, education seems unique. All human experience is in some sense educational. Consequently, as Marx advises, "what has to be done is to arrange the world in such a way that man experiences and becomes accustomed to what is truly human in it..., man's private interests must be made to coincide with the interests of humanity" (Marx and Engels 1975:161-62). A prison post-secondary educational program oriented towards a liberal arts/humanities perspective, and hence reaching beyond the stultifying prison experience, is perhaps able to make some progress towards such a goal.

In any case, the humanistic aspects of the prison university are the closest many prisoner-students will come to experiencing what Marx means by 'what is truly human' about the world, and the prison university is perhaps the only forum in which these prisoners will ever debate the problem of private interests versus those of humanity. Duguid stresses that most criminals come from severely "disadvantaged"

environments and that "traditional studies in the humanities" supplant their lack of 'normal' environmental experiences (see: Duguid and Hoekema 1986:164-65). Ayers even goes so far as to allege that in order to "[r]emain in [the university program], the prisoner really has to give up his convict culture" (quoted in Duguid and Hoekema 1986:233). Furthermore, the evidence of Linden et al, indicating that program participants showed improved attitudes and better disciplinary records, somewhat supports his allegation (1984:72).

Linden's evidence also indicates that post-secondary prison educational programs are among the few (perhaps the only) correctional programs that can even begin to separate prisoners from the socially deprived subcultures from which many of them come (see: Duguid and Hoekema 1986:164-65). Almost every prisoner-student who has graduated from the prison university maintains that academic success depends upon the "opportunity to...tak[e] on a different identity" in the area set aside within the prison for the university (Guiney 1976[a]:42; see also Whetstone 1981:79-82). Guiney elaborates on this theme, pointing out that new program participants "very often surprise themselves, in that, they discover they are capable of much more than they had imagined; that their thinking and their attitude about many things in the world, including themselves, can broaden and change enormously" (Guiney 1976[a]:42, emphasis in original). Thus, the prison university fosters not only the opportunity to enhance personal identity but it contributes to personal achievement, and once again the relationship between self-image and achievement is underscored.

Of course, Guiney is describing the self-liberating aspect of education, which is an integral part of the process that Freire says the oppressed must use to discover the true nature of themselves and the social world (1970:32-33). This is a large step towards enacting Marx's advice; arranging the world so that humans are able to experience humanity. "If man is shaped by environment, then environment must be made human" (Marx and Engels:162). Post-secondary prison educational programs can make at least a small part of the prison environment a little more humane, thus providing an opportunity for prisoner-students to begin the process of developing their true natures.

The only environment that prisoner-students can immediately shape is that which is in their imagination, or mind. However, as prisoners develop this ability, they begin to contribute towards improving the social environment outside of the prison as well as inside of it (recall the Learning Center, the Theatre Group, and the Prison Journal). As Marx points out, since environmental influence negates man's ability "to assert his true individuality, [then] crime must not be punished in the individual, but the anti-social sources of crime must be destroyed" (Marx and Engels 1975:162). The prison university is an effective correctional treatment program, then, because it provides its students with the opportunity to develop part of their true natures, a process which in turn contributes to humanizing the environment and in that way 'destroying' the anti-social sources of crime. In other words, prison post-secondary educational programs make some progress towards motivating students to begin the

long process toward self-understanding, and more importantly yet, self- acceptance, processes which are the pillars of therapeutic models of rehabilitation such as Alcoholics and Narcotics Anonymous. This process can be seen also as the first step toward the application of Marx's dictum advising that 'private interests' must be made to coincide with the 'interests of humanity'. At this point, anthropology can be of tremendous assistance.

ANTHROPOLOGY AND THE PRISON UNIVERSITY (MORE)

Robert Paine suggests in Advocacy and Anthropology that a large part "of the business of anthropology is cultural translation, of seeing in culture the explanations of what people are and do" (1985:xii). Of course, the 'people' are those who anthropologists research, and as Fleisher points out criminals and prisoners have recently gained some acceptance as people whom anthropologists can legitimately study (1992:32). But publishing a relevant study of prisons and prisoners "in the society in which they prevail is, almost unavoidably, to support or subvert them" (Rappaport 1993:297). Paine says that 'cultural translation' is just 'not enough' and that cultural anthropologists are increasingly assuming roles as advocates (1985:256-58), for example in issues such as native land-claims litigation/negotiation.

Since its inception, one of anthropology's central objectives has been to make the social world of those they study comprehensible to others (see: Rappaport 1993:301).

In studies such as those concerning the prison in general, and the prison university particularly, Rappaport says that "anthropology, because of its emphasis on participation as well as observation, remains the social science best equipped to be useful" (1993:301). The anthropologist can specifically help the cause of post-secondary education in prison by assuming the role of an advocate and making the prison university, which is a large part of the world of prisoner-students, comprehensible to non-prisoners. A responsible ethnography of the post-secondary educational programs in the federal prison system is crucial if the true nature of the prison university in terms of its social benefits is to be publicized - especially when the mass media is dominated by retributive, anti-rehabilitative discourse (for example, Rappaport 1993:301).

Consequently, like Glasser and Sutro, I also suggest that " [t]he criminal justice system ...the police, courts, and prisons, cry out for the attention of anthropology" (1992:3). As anthropologists, and citizens, we should consider carefully the fate of advanced education in prison. Unless we involve ourselves, it might well be decided by disciplines considerably more submissive to the whims of prevailing ideology than anthropology - and by disciplines considerably less humane (for a related discussion, Rappaport 1993:302). Cultural anthropologists can expand upon the already significant effectiveness of the prison university in terms of its ability to assist prisoner-students to develop and understand their true natures, the true nature of society, and the process by which they can contribute towards improving their cultural

environments - both in the prison and their communities.

Again, responsible ethnographies are crucial because of their ability to make comprehensible, to describe, and to publicize the nature of particular subcultures and environments. Ethnography can empirically validate, and hence confirm, a number of observations about the prison university that other studies can, at best, only suggest as being likely. For example, is genuine participation in the prison university sometimes truly capable of separating prisoners from the socially disadvantaged environments from which they come, as Duguid claims (with Hoekema 1986:164-65)? Or does genuine participation require that prisoners give up their convict culture, as Ayers alleges (see: Duguid and Hoekema 1986:233)? In any case, the type of ethnographic data that anthropology can provide might lead to empirical, or scientific, support for the capability of prison post-secondary educational programs to so change participants that they may begin working toward humanizing their environments - and in the process make one small step toward reducing crime-rates, recidivism, and prison populations.

But it should not be misinterpreted that the attention of anthropology to post-secondary education in prison, in itself, will make the prison university a better program. Rather, in its role as advocate, anthropology can in a sense 'publicize' the true nature and potential of prison post-secondary educational programs. Of course, in that capacity, anthropology can contribute towards expanding upon the effectiveness of the prison university as a correctional treatment program - but post-

secondary education in prison can, and will, survive on its own merits. The prison university has managed to endure despite that giving prisoners an education at the university level has always been an unpopular idea, both publically and politically (despite support for the notion of 'education as a right').

CORRECTIONAL PROGRAM OR SOCIAL PROGRAM?

In any case, if prisons truly "do little more than dehumanize all who are inside them, guards and prisoners alike" (MacLean 1989:72), as the renowned experiment by Philip Zimbardo suggests (1992:93-98), then post-secondary educational programs are providing an extraordinarily profound service merely by contributing toward the humanization of the prison environment. Moreover, this service is not generally thought of as falling within the traditional, or rehabilitative, role of correctional treatment. Consequently, my thesis will conclude with the obsevation that an argument for the effectiveness of the prison university should correctly begin from the premise that the nature of post-secondary education in prison cannot be assessed solely in terms of treatment, a point implicit in much of my discussion. The prison university has likely endured, first, because it has managed to make one small part of the prison environment just a little more humane.

As I have argued, that small step towards humanizing the prison environment transcends the prison itself and proceeds to have at least some humanizing influence

on the whole of society. Therefore, if prison post-secondary education is deemed an effective method of correctional treatment, it is a result of the progress that the prison university has made towards solving man's central problem, "the problem of humanization" (Freire 1970:27). One of Plato's more famous aphorisms, which has been used to synopsize his entire theory of human nature, says that 'to know the good is to do the good'. Although it has been the subject of much criticism, some of it by Marx, he is surely echoing the same principle when he warns that our private and personal interests must be made to conform to the larger interests of humanity, given the synonymous nature of 'interests of humanity' and 'good'.

In any case, Plato, Marx, and Freire certainly recognize that humanity's interests are best served by education, and not of the 'how-to-do' type either. Clearly, so do Duguid and the rest of the developmentalists; and this is where a classic liberal arts/humanities education applies. In an important study outlining the effects of a liberal arts education on students in a residential setting, Winters et al found that the program, among other things, helped students to understand both sides of controversial problems, to adapt to their environments more realistically, and to develop a more realistic view of their abilities(cited in Duguid 1988:180).

No one would think to call this program treatment; it is education. And a liberal arts/humanities program is every bit as much education in a prison environment, not treatment. In fact, Winters found that the liberal arts approach affected students in the free world in much the same fashion as most of the developmentalists find that

the approach affects prisoners (see: Duguid 1988: 180) - and no one concluded from Winters' data that college-aged students living in residence are characterized by cognitive and/or moral retardation. The point, here, is that the effects of a classic liberal arts/humanities education on most groups of individuals would be similar.

Divorcing the prison university from the notion of treatment leads to thinking of it in terms of its environment, since the prison environment is clearly the distinguishing characteristic of a university education in prison. And the prison environment is a neglected aspect of most arguments falling in the 'treatment versus security' debate. Even when the environment is considered, it is discussed almost always in terms of its influence on a particular project or program, not vice versa. The positive effects of the prison university begin with its humanizing influence on the prison environment. The influence proceeds from there, through the growing experience of prisoner-students and ex-prisoner-students, to affect the larger society. In this role, of course, the prison university transcends the prison and becomes a social force rather than correctional treatment.

CONCLUSION

While the prison university can be seen as an effective method of correctional treatment, it likely succeeds in this capacity simply because improved living skills are an unmistakable effect of a liberal arts/humanities education. Collectively, prisoners cannot be described as emotionally, cognitively, or morally retarded. Rather, from the perspective of the dominant culture, they might be described as culturally illiterate, in the sense that they are often members of subcultures with values different from those of the mainstream and which know little about the values of the mainstream. Education, especially advanced education, is in many cases less accessible to populations which produce prisoners: it is often not accorded the same status within these populations that it is within the mainstream. Consequently, the prison university might be seen as one of the checks and balances which are vital to the democratic system, a mechanism to restore some of the balance of educational opportunities in society. Deterministic philosophers such as d'Holbach, one of the leading personalities of the Enlightenment, argue that the only ethical justification for the existence of prisons rests with their capacity to provide causal antecedents making behavioural change possible (see: Alston and Brandt 1978:403-13), and the prison university, in this sense, might be seen as just such an agent of behavioural change.

In his description of the birth and genesis of the prison, Foucault explains the

impossibility of examining the prison properly without considering it in relationship to the rest of society (see: 1979:for example, 293-308). Similarly, the prison university should not be considered as simply correctional treatment. It is doubly related to society through ramifications stemming from both corrections and education, institutions comprising two of society's largest and most complicated networks. Therefore, a proper investigation requires using an approach that can at once examine corrections, education, justice, culture, various social phenomena, and the complex web of relationships between them. Although by no means a definitive investigation, this thesis suggests that post-secondary education in the prison can be seen clearly as both effective correctional treatment - in its relationship to reduced rates of recidivism, reduced crime rates and reduced prison populations - and effective education - in its relationship to the apparently evolving character of its students.

REFERENCES

Alston, William P. and Richard B. Brandt, eds.
1978 The Problems of Philosophy. 3d ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon Inc.

Ayers, Douglas J., ed.
1981 Proceedings of the National Conference on Prison Education: Its Role and Practice in the Modern Penitentiary. Joint Sponsors: The University of Victoria, The Canadian Association for Adult Education, Correction Services Canada. Victoria: UVic Press.

1981(a) Education in Prisons: A Developmental and Cultural Perspective. In On Prison Education. Lucien Morin, ed., Pp.71-92. Ottawa: Canadian Government Publishing Centre.

Ayers, Douglas J. and Stephen Duguid
1980 Effects of the University of Victoria Program: A Post Release Study. Sponsor: Correction Services Canada. Ottawa: Canadian Government Publishing Centre.

Barak, Gregg, ed.
1991 Crimes by the Capitalist State: An Introduction to State Criminality. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Bates, Daniel G. and Fred Plog, eds.
1991 Human Adaptive Strategies. United States: McGraw-Hill Inc.

Becker, Howard
1971 Sociological Works. United States: Allen Lane.

Bell, Gay
1992 On Prison Education and Women in Prison: An Interview with Therasa Anne Glaremin. Journal of Prisoners on Prisons 4(1):35-40

Benedict, Ruth
1978 An Anthropologist's Views of Values and Morality. In The Problems of Philosophy 3d ed. Alston, William and Richard Brandt, eds. Pp.143-49. Boston: Allyn and Bacon Inc.

Braithwaite, John and Philip Pettit
1990 Not Just Deserts: A Republican Theory of Criminal Justice. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Brown, Les
1985 Justice, Morality and Education. Hong Kong: MacMillan Press

Cosman, J.W.
1981 Penitentiary Education in Canada. In On Prison Education. Lucien Morin, ed., Pp.34-42. Ottawa: Canadian Government Publishing Centre.

Cullen, Francis T. and Karen E. Gilbert
1992 Reaffirming Rehabilitation. In Corrections: An Issues Approach.,Travis et al, eds. Pp.273-90. Cincinnati: Anderson Publishing Co.

Cullen, Francis T. and Paul Gendreau
1989 The Effectiveness of Correctional Rehabilitation: Reconsidering the "Nothing Works" Debate. In The American Prison: Issues in Research and Policy. Goodstein, Lynne and Doris Layton MacKenzie, eds., Pp.23-44. New York:Plenum Press.

Davidson, Howard, ed.
1992 Editorial Note. Journal of Prisoners on Prisons 4(1):1-2

Diullio, John J., Jr.
1991 No Escape: The Future of American Corrections. United States: Basic Books Inc.

Duguid, Stephen
1981 Moral Development, Justice and Democracy in the Prison. Canadian Journal of Criminology 23(2):147-62.

1981(a) Rehabilitation Through Education: A Canadian Model. In On Prison Education. Lucien Morin, ed., Pp.43-54. Ottawa: Canadian Government Publishing Centre.

1983 Origins and Development of University Education at Matsqui Institution. Canadian Journal of Criminology 25(3):277-94.

1988 To Inform Their Discretion: Prison Education and Empowerment. Journal of Correctional Education 39(4):174-181.

Duguid, Stephen and Hendrik Hoekema, eds.
1986 University Education in Prison: A Documentary Record of the Experience in British Columbia. Rev. ed. Burnaby: Simon Fraser University Press.

Duelli, Nicole and Allyson Butt
1986 Journal One Product of Students. In University Education in Prison. Duguid, Stephen and Hendrik Hoekema, eds., Pp.283. Burnaby: Simon Fraser University Press

Edinborough, Arnold
1981 Aims and Nature of Education: A Philosophical Approach. In Proceedings of The National Conference on Prison Education. J. D. Ayers, ed., Pp.23-36. Victoria: UVic Press.

Elton, Tom
1986 Valedictorian Address. In University Education in Prison. Duguid, Stephen and Hendrik Hoekema, eds., Pp.139-140. Burnaby: Simon Fraser University Press.

Fleisher, Mark S.
1992 Getting Involved in the Criminal Justice System. Practicing Anthropology 14(3):32-35.

Foucault, Michel
1979 Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison. trans., Alan Sheridan. New York: Vantage Books

Freire, Paulo
1970 Pedagogy of the Oppressed. trans., Myra Bergman Ramos. New York: Herder and Herder.

Giroux, Henry
1988 Schooling and the Struggle for Public Life: A Critical Pedagogy in the Modern Age. Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.

Glasser, Irene and Livingston J. Sutro, eds.
1992 Anthropology and the Criminal Justice System. Practicing Anthropology 14(3):3-4.

Goodstein, Lynne and Doris Layton MacKenzie
1989 The American Prison: Issues in Research and Policy. New York: Plenum Press.

Grassian, Victor
1981 Moral Reasoning: Ethical Theory and Some Contemporary Moral Problems. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc.
Guiney, Frank

1986 Article: Humanities at Main and Hastings. In University Education in Prison. Duguid, Stephen and Hendrik Hoekema, eds., Pp.258-263. Burnaby: Simon Fraser University Press.

1986(a) Valedictorian Address. In University Education in Prison. Duguid, Stephen and Hendrik Hoekema, eds., Pp.41-43. Burnaby: Simon Fraser University Press.

Harris, Marvin
1992 Culture, People, Nature. New York: Random House.

Henry, Stuart
1991 The Informal Economy: A Crime of Omission by the State. In Crimes by the Capitalist State. Gregg Barak, ed., Pp.252-72. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Jackson, Anthony, ed.
1987 Anthropology at Home. New York: Tavistock Publications.

Johnson, Audrey
1986 The Cons Wear Tights - Ruffles. In University Education in Prison. Duguid, Stephen and Hendrik Hoekema, eds., P.170. Burnaby: Simon Fraser University Press.

Jones, Ray
1992 A Coincidence of Interests: Prison Higher Education in Massachusetts. Journal of Prisoners on Prisons 4(1):3-20

Lewis, Morgan
1981 The Humanities in Prison: A Case Study. In On Prison Education. Lucien Morin, ed., Pp.112-132. Ottawa: Canadian Government Publishing Centre.

Lipton, D., Richard Martinson and J. Wilks
1975 The Effectiveness of Correctional Treatment: A Survey of Treatment Evaluation Studies. New York: Praeger.

Linden, Rick, Linda Perry, Douglas Ayers and T. A. A. Parlett, eds.
1984 An Evaluation of a Prison Education Program. Canadian Journal of Criminology 26(1):65-74.

MacLean, Brian
1989 What is to be Done About the Correctional Enterprise in Canada? Journal of Prisoners on Prisons 1(2):59-72.

1992 Post-Secondary Education in the Prison: Cognitive and Moral Development or Social Control? Journal of Prisoners on Prisons 4(1):21-28.

Maltz, Michael D.
1984 Recidivism. United States: Academic Press

Martinson, Robert
1974 What Works? - Questions and Answers about Prison Reform. The Public Interest. Spring: 22-55.

Marx, K. and Frederich Engels
1975 The Holy Family, or Critique of Critical Criticism. United States: Lawrence and Wishart.

McCarthy, Bill
1985 The Nature of Education Within Canadian Federal Prisons. Canadian Journal of Criminology 27(4):441-54.

McMahon, Maeve W.
1992 The Persistent Prison? Rethinking Decarceration and Penal Reform. intro, Richard Ericson. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Messerschmidt, Donald A., ed.
1981 Anthropologists at Home in North America: Methods and issues in the study of one's own society. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Morin, Lucien, ed.
1981 On Prison Education. Ottawa: Canadian Government Publishing Centre.

Morse, B.
1992 Aboriginal Peoples, the Law, and Justice. In Aboriginal Peoples and Canadian Criminal Justice. Silverman, Robert A. and Marianne O. Neilsen, eds., Pp.45-60. Canada: Butterworths Ltd.

Mueller, G. O. W.
1968 Human Rights and the Treatment of Offenders. The Canadian Journal of Corrections 10(2):352-62.

Mullins, Maye
1985 The Education Committee: A Project in Participatory Education. Colloquium presented to the Department of Secondary Education. Unpublished MA Thesis.

Neilsen, Marianne O.
1992 Introduction. In Aboriginal Peoples and Canadian Criminal Justice. Silverman, Robert A. and Marianne O.Neilsen, eds., Pp.3-10. Canada: Butterworths Ltd.

Paine, Robert, ed.
1985 Advocacy and Anthropology. Institute of Social and Economic Research. St.John's: Memorial University.

Palmer, Ted
1992 The "Effectiveness" Issue Today: An Overview. In Corrections: An Issues Approach. Travis et al, eds., Pp.257-272. Cincinnati: Anderson Publishing Inc.

Parlett, T. A. A.
1981 The Benefits of Advanced Education in Prisons. In On Prison Education. Lucien Morin, ed., Pp.106-111. Ottawa: Canadian Government Publishing Centre.

Rappaport, Roy A.
1993 Distinguished Lecture in General Anthropology: The Anthropology of Trouble. American Anthropologist 95(2):295-303.

Rivera, Juan
1992 A Non-Traditional Approach to a Curriculum for Prisoners in New York State. Journal for Prisoners on Prisons 4(1):29-34.

Ross, Robert, R. and Elizabeth Fabiano
1981 Time to Think: Cognition and Crime: Link and Remediation. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.

Salah-EL, Tiyo Attahlla
1992 Attaining Education in Prison Equals Prisoner Power. Journal of Prisoners on Prisons 4(1):45-52.

Savage, H.
1974 Educational Issues Important in Correctional Institutions. Canadian Journal of Criminology and Corrections 16(2):181-187.

Scharf, Peter
1981 The Idea of Fairness as the Basis for the Educational Reform of the Prison. In On Prison Education. Lucien Morin, ed., Pp.230-235. Ottawa: Canadian Government Publishing Centre.

Silverman, Robert A. and Marianne O. Neilsen, eds.
1992 Aboriginal Peoples and Canadian Criminal Justice. Foreword, Chester Cunningham. Canada: Butterworths Ltd.

Smith, Alex and Louis Berlin, eds.
1988 Treating the Criminal Offender 3rd ed. New York: Plenum Press.

Travis, Lawrence F., Martin D. Schwartz and Todd R. Clear, eds.
1992 Corrections: An Issues Approach 3rd ed. Cincinnati: Anderson Publishing Inc.

Whetstone, Keith
1981 How the Prisoner Sees Education. In Proceedings of the National Conference on Prison Education. J. Douglas Ayers, ed., Pp.79-94. Victoria: UVic Press.

Zimbardo, Philip G.
1992 Pathology of Imprisonment. In Corrections: An Issues Approach. Travis et al, eds., Pp.93-99. Cincinnati: Anderson Publishing Co.